NELR ES/CD TRAINING FEEDBACK FORM

| NAME: | SIGN: | | DATE: | |
|---------|--|-------------------------------------|---|--|
| MISSION | # MISSION DATE | MISSION LOCATION | INCIDENT COMMANDER | |
| | ON OBJECTIVES: (Mission? Were goals communicate | | all mission base personnel briefed on the purpose of | |
| M | lission scenario and objectiv | ves? | | |
| И | Vere all mission base person | nel briefed on the purpose of the | mission? | |
| И | Vere goals communicated? | | | |
| | ATIONS PLAN: (Was a platives? Did it achieve objectives? | | it relevant to mission objectives? Is it in compliance | |
| И | las a plan developed for the | activity? | | |
| И | Vas it relevant to mission obj | ectives? | | |
| Is | s it in compliance with direct | tives? | | |
| D | id it achieve objectives? | | | |
| | | | y officer designated? Were thorough briefings given sion throughout the entire day? Was risk assessment | |
| D | oid IC stress safety? | | | |
| И | Vas a Safety officer designate | ed? | | |
| И | Vere thorough briefings give | n to all members? | | |
| W | las the safely officer monitor | ring all aspects of the mission thr | oughout the entire day? | |
| И | Vas risk assessment used? | | | |
| | | | | |

4. APPROPRIATE USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS: (Was training in accordance with CAP regulations/directives? Were

resources used appropriately? Was the training listed on the approved CAP Form 10 accomplished?)

Was training in accordance with CAP regulations/directives?

NELR Training Feedback Form, 22 May 99

| Was the training listed on the approved CAP Form 10 accomplished? | |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| 5. UTILIZATION OF CORPORATE AIRCRAFT: (Were corporate aircraft fully ut aircraft? Were aircraft assigned missions appropriate to capabilities? What is the condi CAP-USA F Form 12 inspection?) | |
| Were corporate aircraft fully utilized before member owned aircraft? | |
| Were aircraft assigned missions appropriate to capabilities? | |
| What is the condition of corporate aircraft using the CAP-USA F Form 12 inspe | ection?) |
| 6. STAFF EFFECTIVENESS: (How well did the staff interact? Was communication by mission accomplishment? Were periodic staff meetings held? Was training effective? ICS into the exercise? Were POD's properly calculated? During a SAR exercise, could a sorties needed to achieve an 80% POD? | Did the Wing attempt to incorporate |
| How well did the staff interact? | |
| Was communication between staff effective, as measured by mission accomplish | nment? |
| Were periodic staff meetings held? | |
| Was training effective? | |
| Did the Wing attempt to incorporate ICS into the exercise? | |
| Were POD's properly calculated? | |
| During a SAR exercise, could the staff determine the number of sorties needed | to achieve an 80% POD? |
| 7. MISCELLANEOUS: (Were checklists utilized? Were mission dollars accurately tra Management used? Were crew rest/duty day limitations in CAPR 55-1 and 60-1 followed calculations performed correctly? What staff position was not filled and why?) | |
| Were checklists utilized? | |
| Were mission dollars accurately tracked? | |
| Was Operations Risk Management used? | |
| Were crew rest/duty day limitations in CAPR 55-1 and 60-1 followed? | |
| | |

Were resources used appropriately?

Were weight & balance calculations performed correctly?

What staff position was not filled and why?

- **8. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:** (Any other comments of value that can be used during subsequent training missions to improve the overall performance of the wing?)
- 9. OVERALL: (Based on the parameters of the Evaluation Checklist used during the SAR/DR/CD Evals)

EVENT GRADE:

RESOURCES:

MC SENIORS:
AIR CAD'S:
GRD OPS CORP A/C:
COMM NON A/C:
SAFETY VEHICLES: